

**EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

*Table of Contents*

<i>Amendments &amp; Claim Status</i>	2
<i>Response to Arguments</i>	2
<i>Remarks Persuasive regarding Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103</i>	2
<i>Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103</i>	2
<i>Allowable Subject Matter</i>	2
<i>Reasons for Allowance</i>	3
<i>Conclusion</i>	3

*Amendments & Claim Status*

[1] This “Examiner’s Statement of Reasons for Allowance” is responsive to “Amendment in Response to Non-Final Office Action” (Amendment) received Sep. 23, 2009. Claims 1, 4-9, and 14-22 remain pending; claims 2-3 and 10-13 cancelled.

*Response to Arguments*

*Remarks Persuasive regarding Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103*

[2] Amendment at 8 regarding rejected Claims 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daugman (U.S. Patent No. 5,291,560) in view of Flom (U.S. Patent No. 4,641,349); rejected Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Min (U.S. Patent No. 6,760,467) in view of Flom and further in view of Jones (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0107801); rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Min in view of Flom have been respectfully and fully considered, and are found persuasive.

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103*

[3] In response to Amendment at 8, the previous 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are withdrawn.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

[4] Claims 1, 4-9, and 14-22 allowed.

Reasons for Allowance

[5] The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding Claim 1, while the prior art or record teaches Claim 1, Sep. 23, 2008 (see Office Action at p. 6, Oct. 21, 2008), the prior art or record does not teach detecting the presence or absence of static textual roughness and wherein the predetermined feature is one of or a combination of two or more of moment, central moment, skewness, and kurtosis of pixel values.

"Static textual roughness" was discussed during the Jan. 14, 2009 interview, and agreed to be interpreted as independent of time (e.g., the textual roughness as viewed on a "static" piece of paper). See also "Amendment" at p. 11, Jan. 21, 2009.

Claims 14-16 allowable by analogy. Claims 4-9 and 17-22 allowable by dependency.

[6] Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

***Conclusion***

[7] Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID P. RASHID whose telephone number is (571)270-1578 and fax number (571)270-2578. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday 7:30 - 17:00 ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

Art Unit: 2624

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*/David P. Rashid/*  
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/Bhavesh M Mehta/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624

David P Rashid  
Examiner  
Art Unit 26244